

Capitola Planning Commission

Agenda Report



Meeting: November 3, 2022

From: Community Development Department

Topic: 216 Central Avenue

Permit Number: #20-0103

APN: 036-122-22

Design Permit, Historic Alteration Permit, Minor Modification for the required parking space dimensions, and Variance for the nonconforming calculation to construct first- and second-story additions to a historic single-family residence located within the R-1 (Single-Family Residential) zoning district.

This project is in the Coastal Zone and requires a Coastal Development Permit which is appealable to the California Coastal Commission after all possible appeals are exhausted through the City.

Environmental Determination: Categorical Exemption

Property Owner: Lorraine Krilanovich and Lynn Jackson

Representative: Scott Mitchell, Filed: 06.09.22

Applicant Proposal:

The applicant is proposing 768-square-feet of first- and second-story additions to an existing 1,166-square-foot, one-story, single-family residence located at 216 Central Avenue within the R-1 (Single-Family Residential) zoning district.

Background:

On January 6, 2000, the Planning Commission approved permit #99-106, which included a minor land division, Coastal Development Permit, and architectural and site review to allow the relocation of a single-family residence and detached garage from 112 Central Avenue to a new lot at 216 Central Avenue. The project included the approval of variances for the minimum allowable lot size of 5,000 square feet, reduced side and rear yard setbacks for the detached garage, and the onsite parking requirements.

On June 1, 2000, the Planning Commission approved permit #00-40, which included a 120-square-foot addition to the rear of the existing residence. On December 6, 2001, the Planning Commission approved a modification to the permit which included the removal of the picket fence requirement and addition of an arbor in the front yard.

On April 28, 2021, the Architectural and Site Review Committee reviewed the application and provided the applicant with the following direction:

Public Works Representative, Danielle Uharriet: informed the applicant they would need to submit a site drainage plan and a site plan showing all pervious and impervious surfaces with respective square footage prior to Planning Commission review of the project. Mrs. Uharriet also informed the applicant that several standard public works conditions of approval and a condition of approval requiring the existing landscaped area at the corner of Central Avenue and Escalona Drive to be maintained as a clear site

distance triangle with 20 feet along each street frontage would be added to the conditions of approval for the project.

Building Official, Robin Woodman: had no comments.

Local Historian, Carolyn Swift: commented that she was pleased that the building was recognized as having a historic status and that she was impressed by analysis by PAST consultants. Ms. Swift stated that she was concerned with the massing of the proposed addition despite the consultant finding the project in compliance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards. Ms. Swift felt the structure would be less impactful by reducing the total height to 25-feet rather than the proposed 27 feet.

Associate Planner, Matt Orbach: informed the applicant that staff could not support the variance request to provide only two parking because the required findings could not be made. Mr. Orbach presented several onsite parking alternatives that could provide the onsite parking without requiring a variance. Mr. Orbach also reviewed the request for a height exception and pointed out that, if the additional two feet of floor height that were included in the second story to maximize the second-story view were removed, a height exception would not be needed to accommodate the hipped/mansard roof that complements the existing roof pitch on the historic structure.

On June 9, 2022, the application was formally submitted for full review under the updated zoning code. The submittal included a landscape plan, revised designs that reduced total structure height from 27 feet to 25 feet, the inclusion of a third parking space, and a minor modification request for sub-standard garage space.

Development Standards:

The following table outlines the zoning code requirements for development in the R-1 Zoning District. With a variance to the construction cost calculation and a minor modification to the required parking dimensions, the project complies with all development standards of the R-1 zoning district.

Development Standards		
Building Height		
R-1 Regulation	Existing	Proposed
25 ft.	18 ft. 2 in.	25 ft.
Floor Area Ratio (FAR)		
	Existing	Proposed
Lot size	4,486 sq. ft.	4,486 sq. ft.
Maximum Floor Area Ratio	52% (Max 2,333 sq. ft.)	52% (Max 2,333 sq. ft.)
First Story Floor Area	1,058 sq. ft.	1,226 sq. ft.
Second Story Floor Area	108 sq. ft.	770 sq. ft.
Detached Garage	333 sq. ft.	333 sq. ft.
Total FAR	33.4% (1,499 sq. ft.)	50.5% (2,267 sq. ft.)

Setbacks				
	R-1 regulation		Existing	Proposed
Front Yard 1st Story	15 ft.		14 ft. 1 in.	14 ft. 1 in. Existing Nonconforming
Front Yard 2nd Story	20 ft.		N/A	36 ft. 6 in.
Side Yard 1st Story – Interior	10% lot width	Lot width 45 ft. 4 ft. 6 in.	6 ft.	6 ft.
Side Yard 1st Story – Exterior Side (Escalona Drive)	10 ft.	10 ft.	11 ft. 6 in.	10 ft. 9 in.
Side Yard 2nd Story - Interior	15% of width	Lot width 45 ft. 6 ft. 9 in min.	N/A	6 ft. 9 in.
Side Yard 2nd Story – Exterior Side (Escalona Drive)	10 ft.	10 ft.	N/A	10 ft.
Rear Yard 1st Story	Neighbor Side Setback	4 ft. 7 in.	40 ft. 3 in.	29 ft. 9 in.
Rear Yard 2nd Story	Neighbor Side Setback	4 ft. 7 in.	N/A	29 ft. 9 in.
Detached Garage				
	R-1 Regulation		Existing	Proposed
Height	12 ft.		16 ft. 4 in.	16 ft. 4 in. Existing nonconforming
Front	40 ft.		80 ft. 2 in.	80 ft. 2 in.
Interior Side	3 ft.		2 in.	2 in. Existing nonconforming
Exterior Side	10 ft.		12 ft. 6 in.	12 ft. 6 in.
Rear	3 ft.		3 ft.	3 ft.
Parking				
Residential (1,600 to 2,000 sq. ft.)	Required		Existing	Proposed
	3 spaces total 1 covered 2 uncovered		1 spaces total 1 covered 0 uncovered Existing Nonconforming	3 spaces total 1 covered 2 uncovered Minor Modification Requested
Underground Utilities: Required with 25% increase in area				Required

Discussion:

The existing residence at 216 Central Avenue is an historic, one-story, single-family residence with a detached garage that was relocated from 112 Central Avenue in the year 2000. The lot is in the Depot Hill neighborhood and is surrounded by one- and two-story single-family homes,

the historic Casa Blanca Apartments at 219 Central Avenue/240 Monterey Avenue, and the Inn at Depot Hill.

Design Permit

The applicant is proposing 768-square-foot of first- and second-story additions (Attachment 1). The proposed additions will replace the second-story loft and prior additions from 2000 and expand the existing 108 square-foot second story to 770 square-feet. Exterior finishes will include six-inch horizontal board siding with three-quarter-inch channels on the first and second story, painted to match the existing single-family residence, with a composition shingle roof to match the existing roof. The second-story addition has a mansard-style roof with a pitch matching the original gables. The siding on the existing historic single-family residence is ten-inch board horizontal siding with one-inch channels. The change in the siding dimensions creates a delineation between the historic home and the new addition. The additions comply with the development standards for the R-1 zoning district.

Historical Alteration Permit

The project involves substantial alterations to the existing structure and therefore requires approval of a Historic Alteration Permit by the Planning Commission. Also, historic resources are identified as environmental resources within the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Any modification to a historic resource must comply with the Secretary of Interior Standards to qualify for a CEQA exemption.

The primary residence was constructed in approximately 1891 at 112 Central Avenue. A historic report on the property was completed in 1999 to determine whether the structure was historically significant (Attachment 10). The report found that the structure itself was historic on the local level but not eligible for listing on the state or national registers. The primary residence and the detached garage were approved for relocation to 216 Central Avenue under permit #99-106 in January 2000. The approval included multiple variances related to 216 Central Avenue, which permitted a new lot under permit #99-106. The variances included a substandard lot size of less than 5,000 square feet, no onsite parking, and the location of the detached garage within the required side and rear setbacks. The special circumstance finding applied to the approval of the substandard lot size and parking variances was that "approval of this project will allow for the relocation/preservation of a residence included in the 1986 Capitola Architectural Survey." The Planning Commission used the local historic significance of the structure to justify the variances that allowed the substandard lot to be created and for the house to be relocated without providing the required onsite parking and garage setbacks.

After the structure was relocated to 216 Central Avenue in 2000, it was identified in the 2004 Depot Hill Historic District Feasibility Study and the 2005 Capitola Historic Structures List as a potential contributor to the proposed Depot Hill Historic District. Based on these facts, the Community Development Director determined that a third-party architectural historian should be contracted to provide an updated assessment of the structure in its current location, its significance, and if it is subject to the Secretary of Interior Standards (Standards) pursuant to CEQA.

Architectural Historian Leslie Dill provided a historical status review for the property on July 27, 2020 (Attachment 9). According to Ms. Dill, "the c. 1891 cottage continues to convey contributing associations with the Hihn years of development of the potential Depot Hill Historic District, and with the German immigrant community in the immediate area at the turn of the last century." The review concluded that "the property qualifies as a historic resource" as it would contribute to a feasible historic district within Depot Hill.

Following the determination that the property was a historic resource, architectural historian Seth Bergstein of Past Consultants was contracted by the City to conduct the third-party historic review of the proposed project to determine whether it complied with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Preservation (*Standards*). Mr. Bergstein provided a preliminary review letter on September 29, 2020, that recommended reducing the second-story massing, replacing the shed roof with a hipped roof, beginning the second-story addition behind the rear eave line of the original cross gable, in-setting the sidewalls of the rear addition to allow the left- and right-side gable ends of the original cross-gable to be visible, and using different wall cladding to achieve differentiation between the original house and the proposed addition (Attachment 8). Following the preliminary review letter, the applicant revised the plans to include a mansard roof, moved the second-story addition one foot four inches back from the rear eave line of the original cross gable, and included six-inch board horizontal siding which is easily differentiated from the ten-inch board on the historic structure.

Mr. Bergstein provided a final design review letter on December 28, 2020, stating that the current design complies with the Standards (Attachment 7).

Non-Conforming Structure

The existing dwelling is located within the required front setback and is therefore considered a non-conforming structure. Pursuant to code section 17.92.070, structural alterations to an existing non-complying structure may not exceed 80 percent of the present fair market value of the structure. The building official has reviewed the existing and proposed values and concluded that the proposed alterations will exceed 80 percent. Bringing the historic home into compliance with setbacks would require either relocation of the structure or removal the front wall, which is the best-preserved elevation of the historic structure and contrary to Secretary of the Interior Standards. All proposed additions comply with setback and height requirements.

Variance – Nonconforming Construction Cost Calculation

The applicant is seeking approval of a variance to the construction cost calculation limitations for non-conforming structures. The existing residence is within less than 15 feet from the front property line and therefore considered a non-conforming structure.

Pursuant to §17.128.060, the Planning Commission, on the basis of the evidence submitted at the hearing, may grant a variance permit when it finds:

A. There are unique circumstances applicable to the subject property, including size, shape, topography, location, or surroundings, that do not generally apply to other properties in the vicinity or in the same zone as the subject property.

Staff Analysis: There are unique circumstance applicable to the subject property includes a historic residence which is protected within the municipal code and under CEQA. The nonconforming section portion of the structure is historic and will be preserved in the prominent front elevation.

B. The strict application of the zoning code requirements would deprive the subject property of privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity or in the same zone as the subject property.

Staff Analysis: The proposed modifications complies with all height, setback, and FAR requirements. The strict application of the zoning code requirements for both nonconforming and historic preservation would deprive the subject property of development alternatives typically available such as demolition.

C. The variance is necessary to preserve a substantial property right possessed by other property in the vicinity or in the same zone as the subject property.

Staff Analysis: The variance is necessary to preserve the ability to construction additions in a manner consistent with current development standards and historic preservation.

D. The variance will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare, or be injurious to the properties or improvements in the vicinity or in the same zone as the subject property.

Staff Analysis: The variance will not impose any detrimental impacts on the public health, safety, or welfare, or be injurious to properties or improvements in the vicinity or in the same zone as the subject property. The variance allows additions which comply with the maximum floor area ratio (FAR) with while preserving historically significant portions of the structure.

E. The variance does not constitute a grant of special privilege inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity or in the same zone as the subject property.

Staff Analysis: The variance does not grant privileges in excess of the objective development standards applicable to all properties in the vicinity and the within the same zone. The variance allows the property to expand a structure without addressing an existing nonconformity due to its historic status. In 2014, a similar variance was granted at 124 Central Avenue for an addition to a nonconforming historic structure. The application at 124 Central Avenue also included alterations greater than 80 percent of the fair market value.

F. The variance will not have adverse impacts on coastal resources.

Staff Analysis: The variance will not adversely impact coastal resources.

Minor Modification

Pursuant to CMC §17.76.020(C)(2), if the floor area for a residential use is enlarged by more than ten percent, the full parking requirements must be met. The proposed addition exceeds 50 percent of the existing gross floor area, so parking must be brought into compliance. With the proposed addition, three parking spaces are required, one of which must be covered. The applicant is proposing to keep the existing-nonconforming garage space and add two new uncovered 9-foot by 18-foot tandem parking spaces. The two tandem spaces located in the driveway are in compliance. The applicant is seeking a minor modification for the minimum required parking dimensions for the 9-foot wide by 18-foot, 10-inch deep garage space (Attachment 5). Interior parking spaces are required to be a minimum of 10-feet by 20-feet.

Pursuant to §17.136.060, the Planning Commission, on the basis of the evidence submitted at the hearing, may grant a minor modification when it finds:

A. The modification will be compatible with adjacent structures and uses and is consistent with the character of the neighborhood or district where it is located.

Staff Analysis: The proposed parking arrangement is compatible with neighborhood as it is a single driveway and enables the project to provide to have two uncovered tandem space and one covered space.

B. The modification will not adversely impact neighboring properties or the community at large.

Staff Analysis: The proposal increases overall parking opportunities for the site from one space to three spaces. This will not adversely impact neighboring properties.

C. The modification is necessary due to unique characteristics of the subject property, structure, or use.

Staff Analysis: Site parking is directly constrained by the historic structure, the existing driveway, and garage. The garage has an existing space that is substandard. By allowing the modification, no changes to the existing garage are necessary.

D. The modification will be consistent with the purpose of the zoning district, the general plan, local coastal program, and any adopted area or neighborhood plan.

Staff Analysis: The proposed parking arrangement provides the required number of on-site spaces in all respects except parking dimension within the garage. The substandard garage space will accommodate most modern vehicles and allowing the modification is consistent with the purpose of the zoning district, general plan, and LCP.

E. The modification will not establish a precedent.

Staff Analysis: The site is subject to irregular shape and dimensions, an existing-nonconforming garage, and a historic structure. The proposed modification has been evaluated on a site- and project- specific basis and will not establish a precedent.

F. The modification will not adversely impact coastal resources.

Staff Analysis: The subject property does not contain coastal resources. Additional on-site parking will not adversely impact coastal resources in the area.

CEQA:

Section 15332 of CEQA Guidelines exempts in-fill development projects which meet all conditions within the exemption. The project involves additions to an existing single-family residence and subject to the R-1 (single-family residential) zoning district. No adverse environmental impacts were discovered during review of the proposed project. Specifically, the project has been reviewed and found to be consistent with Section 15300.2(f) for modifications to historical resources.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends the Planning Commission **approve** the application #20-0103 based on Conditions and Findings for Approval.

Attachments:

1. 216 Central Avenue – Full Plan Set
2. 216 Central Avenue – Street Renderings
3. 216 Central Avenue – Color and Material Information
4. 216 Central Avenue – Variance Request
5. 216 Central Avenue – Minor Modification Request
6. 216 Central Avenue – Construction Cost Calculation
7. 216 Central Avenue – Final SOI Standards Review Letter – 12.28.20
8. 216 Central Avenue – Preliminary Review Letter – 09.29.20
9. 216 Central Avenue – Historical Status Review – 07.27.20
10. 112 Central Avenue – Original Historic Report – 11.30.1999
11. 216 Central Avenue – Local Historian Comment Letter – 04.26.21
12. Design Permit Design Review Criteria

Conditions of Approval:

1. The project approval consists of 770 square-foot of first- and second-story additions to a historic, nonconforming residence. The maximum Floor Area Ratio for the 4,486 square foot property is 52% (2,333 square feet). The total FAR of the project is 50.5% with a total of 2,267 square feet, compliant with the maximum FAR within the zone. The proposed project is approved as indicated on the final plans reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission on November 3, 2022, except as modified through conditions imposed by the Planning Commission during the hearing.
2. Prior to construction, a building permit shall be secured for any new construction or modifications to structures authorized by this permit. Final building plans shall be consistent with the plans approved by the Planning Commission. All construction and site improvements shall be completed according to the approved plans.
3. At time of submittal for building permit review, the Conditions of Approval must be printed in full on the cover sheet of the construction plans.
4. At time of submittal for demolition and/or building permit review, the applicant shall include a demolition work of scope statement and a demolition plan clearly identifying all areas of walls and floors to be demolished. The City may require a letter from a structural engineer. Any modifications to the demolition plans, including modifications to the scope of work, means and methods of demolition/construction, or changes to the framing, windows, or any other exterior elements shall be submitted to the Building Department for review and approval prior to proceeding with demolition and/or construction. In the course of construction, the City may require additional plans as they deem necessary.
5. At time of submittal for building permit review, Public Works Standard Detail SMP STRM shall be printed in full and incorporated as a sheet into the construction plans. All construction shall be done in accordance with the Public Works Standard Detail BMP STRM.
6. Prior to making any changes to approved plans, modifications must be specifically requested and submitted in writing to the Community Development Department. Any significant changes to the size or exterior appearance of the structure shall require Planning Commission approval.
7. Prior to issuance of building permit, a landscape plan shall be submitted and approved by the Community Development Department. The landscape plan can be produced by the property owner, landscape professional, or landscape architect. Landscape plans shall reflect the Planning Commission approval and shall identify type, size, and location of species and details of any proposed (but not required) irrigation systems.
8. Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the applicant shall complete landscape work to reflect the approval of the Planning Commission. Specifically, required landscape areas, all required tree plantings, privacy mitigations, erosion controls, irrigation systems, and any other required measures shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director.
9. Prior to issuance of building permit, all Planning fees associated with permit #20-0103 shall be paid in full.

10. Prior to issuance of building permit, the developer shall pay Affordable housing impact fees as required to assure compliance with the City of Capitola Affordable Housing Impact Fee Ordinance.
11. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant must provide documentation of plan approval by the following entities: Santa Cruz County Sanitation Department, Soquel Creek Water District, and Central Fire Protection District.
12. Prior to issuance of building permits, a drainage plan, grading, sediment and erosion control plan, shall be submitted to the City and approved by Public Works. The plans shall be in compliance with the requirements specified in Capitola Municipal Code Chapter 13.16 Storm Water Pollution Prevention and Protection.
13. Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall submit a stormwater management plan to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works which implements all applicable Post Construction Requirements (PCRs) and Public Works Standard Details, including all standards relating to low impact development (LID).
14. Prior to any land disturbance, a pre-site inspection must be conducted by the grading official to verify compliance with the approved erosion and sediment control plan.
15. Prior to any work in the City road right of way, an encroachment permit shall be acquired by the contractor performing the work. No material or equipment storage may be placed in the road right-of-way.
16. During construction, any construction activity shall be subject to a construction noise curfew, except when otherwise specified in the building permit issued by the City. Construction noise shall be prohibited between the hours of nine p.m. and seven-thirty a.m. on weekdays. Construction noise shall be prohibited on weekends with the exception of Saturday work between nine a.m. and four p.m. or emergency work approved by the building official. §9.12.010B
17. Prior to a project final, all cracked or broken driveway approaches, curb, gutter, or sidewalk shall be replaced per the Public Works Standard Details and to the satisfaction of the Public Works Department. All replaced driveway approaches, curb, gutter or sidewalk shall meet current Accessibility Standards.
18. Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, compliance with all conditions of approval shall be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director. Upon evidence of non-compliance with conditions of approval or applicable municipal code provisions, the applicant shall remedy the non-compliance to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director or shall file an application for a permit amendment for Planning Commission consideration. Failure to remedy a non-compliance in a timely manner may result in permit revocation.
19. This permit shall expire 24 months from the date of issuance. The applicant shall have an approved building permit and construction underway before this date to prevent permit expiration. Applications for extension may be submitted by the applicant prior to expiration pursuant to Municipal Code section 17.156.080.

20. The planning and infrastructure review and approval are transferable with the title to the underlying property so that an approved project may be conveyed or assigned by the applicant to others without losing the approval. The permit cannot be transferred off the site on which the approval was granted.
21. Upon receipt of certificate of occupancy, garbage and recycling containers shall be placed out of public view on non-collection days.
22. Prior to issuance of building permits, the building plans must show that the existing overhead utility lines will be underground to the nearest utility pole.
23. Outdoor lighting shall comply with all relevant standards pursuant to Municipal Code Section 17.96.110, including that all outdoor lighting shall be shielded and directed downward.
24. Prior to issuance of a building permits, the applicant shall submit a preservation plan to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department. In addition to Condition #25(a), the plan shall specify differentiation of new horizontal boards from the existing horizontal board width.
25. Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, or reconstruction shall be followed.
 - a. Prior to the remodel of the historic residence, the applicant shall catalog all existing details of the structure. Once the existing structure is ready to be remodeled, the applicant is required to have an inspection by the City Planner and Building Inspector to ensure all existing materials are documented in accordance with the preservation plan. Existing materials must be stored in a weatherproof area.
 - b. Any removal of existing building materials or features on historic buildings shall be approved by the Community Development Department prior to removal.
 - c. The applicant and/or contractor shall field verify all existing conditions on historic buildings and match replacement elements and materials according to the approved plans. Any discrepancies found between approved plans, replacement features and existing elements must be reported to the Community Development Department for further direction, prior to construction.

Design Permit Findings:

- A. The proposed project is consistent with the general plan, local coastal program, and any applicable specific plan, area plan, or other design policies and regulations adopted by the city council.**

Community Development Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed the proposed additions to an existing residence. With the granting of a variance to the side setback of the primary residence, the project secures the purpose of the General Plan, and Local Coastal Program, and design policies and regulations adopted by the City Council.

- B. The proposed project complies with all applicable provisions of the zoning code and municipal code.**

Community Development Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed the application for additions to an existing residence and new attached garage. With the

granting of a variance to the side setback of the primary residence, the project complies with all applicable provisions of the zoning code and municipal code.

C. The proposed project has been reviewed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Section 15332 of CEQA Guidelines exempts in-fill development projects which meet all conditions within the exemption. The project involves additions to an existing single-family residence and subject to the R-1 (Single-Family Residential) zoning district. With approval of a variance for the nonconforming construction calculation and minor modification for the minimum required parking dimensions, the project meets all applicable general plan policies and zoning regulations; the project site does not have any identified habitat value; the project will not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality; and the site is and can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services. The project has also been found to be consistent with Section 15300.2(f) for modifications to historical resources.

D. The proposed development will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare or materially injurious to the properties or improvements in the vicinity.

The proposed project will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare or materially injurious to the properties or improvements in the vicinity.

E. The proposed project complies with all applicable design review criteria in Section 17.120.070 (Design review criteria).

The Community Development Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed the application. With the granting of a variance to the side setback of the primary residence, the proposed complies with all applicable design review criteria in Section 17.120.070.

F. The proposed project maintains the character, scale, and development pattern of the neighborhood.

Community Development Staff and the Planning Commission have all reviewed the application. The remodeled design preserves the original front elevation of the historic structure and focuses new massing towards the rear of the building. The project will maintain the character, scale, and development pattern of the neighborhood.

Historic Alteration Findings:

A. The historic character of a property is retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize the property is avoided.

Community Development Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed the proposed remodel of the historic structure and determined the additions are located such that they limit publicly visible alterations that would impact the historic character and the structure will retain the character-defining features identified by the architectural historian.

B. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of fine craftsmanship that characterize a property are preserved.

Community Development Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed the proposed project and determined that distinctive design will be preserved by retaining the distinctive cross-gable roof, shed-roofed entry porch, horizontal wood siding, and wood window surrounds.

- C. Any new additions complement the historic character of the existing structure. New building components and materials for the addition are similar in scale and size to those of the existing structure.**

Community Development Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed the proposed additions to the structure and determined that they are focused to the rear of the structure and non-primary elevation. The second story addition has been located behind the existing cross-gable ridgeline to create spatial separation. Use of exterior materials matches the original sections but will be differentiated with different board and detail widths.

- D. Deteriorated historic features are repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature matches the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials.**

Community Development Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed the proposed project and determined that historic features will be preserved, reused, and repaired to the extent possible. The additions are located such that the remove and replace non-original sections of the structure and removal of original materials and features will be limited.

- E. Archeological resources are protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures are undertaken.**

Community Development Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed the proposed involves additions to an existing residence will not impact archeological resources.

Variance Findings:

- A. There are unique circumstances applicable to the subject property, including size, shape, topography, location, or surroundings, that do not generally apply to other properties in the vicinity or in the same zone as the subject property.**

Staff Analysis: There are unique circumstance applicable to the subject property includes a historic residence which is protected within the municipal code and under CEQA. The nonconforming section portion of the structure is also the best-preserved and most visible front elevation.

- B. The strict application of the zoning code requirements would deprive the subject property of privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity or in the same zone as the subject property.**

Staff Analysis: The proposed modifications complies with all height, setback, and FAR requirements. The strict application of the zoning code requirements for both nonconforming and historic preservation would deprive the subject property of development alternatives typically available such as demolition.

- C. The variance is necessary to preserve a substantial property right possessed by other property in the vicinity or in the same zone as the subject property.**

Staff Analysis: The variance is necessary to preserve the ability to construction additions in a manner consistent with current development standards and historic preservation.

- D. The variance will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare, or be injurious to the properties or improvements in the vicinity or in the same zone as the subject property.**

Staff Analysis: The variance will not impose any detrimental impacts on the public health, safety, or welfare, or be injurious to properties or improvements in the vicinity or in the same zone as the subject property. The variance allows additions which comply with the maximum floor area ratio (FAR) with while preserving historically significant portions of the structure.

E. The variance does not constitute a grant of special privilege inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity or in the same zone as the subject property.

Staff Analysis: The variance does not grant privileges in excess of the objective development standards applicable to all properties in the vicinity and the within the same zone. The variance allows the property to expand a structure without addressing an existing nonconformity due to its historic status. In 2014, a similar variance was granted at 124 Central Avenue for an addition to a nonconforming historic structure. The application at 124 Central Avenue also included alterations greater than 80 percent of the fair market value.

F. The variance will not have adverse impacts on coastal resources

Staff Analysis: The variance will not adversely impact coastal resources.

Minor Modification Findings:

A. The modification will be compatible with adjacent structures and uses and is consistent with the character of the neighborhood or district where it is located.

Staff Analysis: The proposed parking arrangement enables the project to provide the required number of onsite parking spaces, including the covered parking requirement.

B. The modification will not adversely impact neighboring properties or the community at large.

Staff Analysis: The proposal increases overall parking opportunities for the site and, indirectly, the neighborhood. Although the garage space is considered substandard it meets the minimum dimensions of a 9-foot wide by 18-foot deep tandem space.

C. The modification is necessary due to unique characteristics of the subject property, structure, or use.

Staff Analysis: Site parking is directly constrained by the historic structure, the existing driveway and garage, and the narrowing of the lot. Capitola lots typically have a minimum depth of at least 70 feet. On corner lots where parking may be arranged on the exterior side, lots typically have a minimum depth of at least 40 feet, which would allow for two compliant uncovered spaces. The driveway area has a lot depth (width) that tapers to less than 34 feet. The unique shape of this lot prevents the ability to arrange tandem parking spaces with straight approaches. Expanding the existing forward garage would limit accessibility and siting of the two uncovered spaces.

D. The modification will be consistent with the purpose of the zoning district, the general plan, local coastal program, and any adopted area or neighborhood plan.

Staff Analysis: The proposed parking arrangement provides the required number of on-site spaces, the required number of covered spaces and has been designed to comply with parking requirements in all respects except parking dimension. The substandard garage space will accommodate most modern vehicles.

E. The modification will not establish a precedent.

Staff Analysis: The site is subject to irregular shape and dimensions, an existing-nonconforming garage, and a historic structure. The proposed modification has been evaluated on a site- and project- specific basis and will not establish a precedent.

F. The modification will not adversely impact coastal resources.

Staff Analysis: The subject property does not contain coastal resources. Additional on-site parking will not adversely impact coastal resources in the area.

Coastal Development Permit Findings:

A. The project is consistent with the LCP land use plan, and the LCP implementation program.

The proposed development conforms to the City's certified Local Coastal Plan (LCP) land use plan and the LCP implementation program.

B. The project maintains or enhances public views.

The proposed project is located on private property at 216 Central Avenue. The project will not negatively impact public landmarks and/or public views.

C. The project maintains or enhances vegetation, natural habitats and natural resources.

The proposed project is located at 216 Central Avenue. The proposed project will maintain or enhance vegetation consistent with the allowed use and will not have an effect on natural habitats or natural resources.

D. The project maintains or enhances low-cost public recreational access, including to the beach and ocean.

The project will not negatively impact low-cost public recreational access.

E. The project maintains or enhances opportunities for visitors.

The project will not negatively impact visitor serving opportunities.

F. The project maintains or enhances coastal resources.

The project involves residential additions on private property and will not negatively impact coastal resources.

G. The project, including its design, location, size, and operating characteristics, is consistent with all applicable design plans and/or area plans incorporated into the LCP.

With the granting of a variance for the nonconforming construction calculation and a minor modification for the parking dimensions of the covered space, the proposed residential project complies with all applicable design criteria, design guidelines, area plans, and development standards. The operating characteristics are consistent with the R-1 (Single-Family Residential) zone.

H. The project is consistent with the LCP goal of encouraging appropriate coastal development and land uses, including coastal priority development and land uses (i.e., visitor serving development and public access and recreation).

The project involves additions to an historic residence on a residential lot of record. The project is consistent with the LCP goals for appropriate coastal development and land uses. The use is an allowed use consistent with the R-1 zoning district.